

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-8062

THE CITY OF
COLUMBUS

ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
DEVELOPMENT

MEETING SUMMARY

date

December 20, 2018

place

Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room

111 North Front Street, Room 205

time

4:00pm – 7:00pm

present

Doreen Uhas Sauer, Frank Petruziello, Keoni Fleming, Steven Papineau, Kerry Reeds

absent

Pasquali Grado, Kerry Reeds

A. 4:05 Business of the Board

1. Approval of Meeting Summary from October 25, 2018

motion by Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Reeds

Motion To approve the meeting summary as submitted.

Vote

4-0

2. Approval of Meeting Summary from November 15, 2018

motion by Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Reeds

motion To approve the meeting with modifications:

- Mr. Fleming recused himself for agenda items A9 and A10
- Mr. Petruziello recused himself for agenda items A2 and A4

vote

4-0

B. Applications for Certificate of Approval

1. address 1227 North High Street Condado

app no.: UID_18-12-006

applicant: Eric Hoy/Columbus Sign Company

reviewed: Signs

4:05 – 4:28

Staff Report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Mr. Hoy presented the proposal.

discussion:

- Mr. Petruziello asked why the two signs had two completely different aesthetics.
- Mr. Hoy was unsure. He indicated the wall sign was halo illuminated and not internal. The projecting sign had both internal and halo.
- Mr. Fleming stated that it seems that the wall sign seems to be illuminated internally. Which is it?
- Mr. Hoy was unsure, but said they would like it to be both.
- Mr. Reeds asked if the existing projecting sign was going to stay.
- Mr. Hoy said that projecting sign would be removed.
- Mr. Petruziello said they generally do not approve good or services on a sign, so Tacos would not be approved.
- Mr. Fleming said they were over the area of the projecting sign, and the arrow and Tacos were superfluous. He added that there was no reason for the wall sign to be so large.
- Mr. Hoy said that perhaps they could go down to 20 inches in height instead of 26. Tacos could be removed, but he would like the arrow to remove.
- Mr. Petruziello stated that the projecting sign does not have to be 10 inches thick. It should be smaller. He also stated that the black should be opaque and only the colors light up.

motion by

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Fleming

To approve the proposal with the following conditions

motion

- Wall sign should be limited to 20 inches in height and reduced proportionally
- Projecting sign “tacos” and arrow should be removed
- Projecting sign should be limited to 7 inches thick (or slightly greater if warranted)
- Projecting sign should have an opaque black background
- Existing projecting sign should be removed.
- All power should be concealed with no raceways

vote

- Bolts should be covered where the arms mount to the wall.

5 - 0 to Approve**2. address****1770 Indianola Avenue****Chi Omega**

app no.:

UID_18-11-008

applicant:

Jeffrey Brown/Zaco Inc.

reviewed:

Variances**4:28 – 4:42**

Staff report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Mr. Brown and Mr. Acock presented the proposal.
- Mr. Fleming indicated that the five feet of drive aisle in the alley would be better served as green space against the house.
- Mr. Reed asked how wide the alley was
- Mr. Acock indicated it was 20 feet, but they were told by the One Stop Shop to stay out of the five feet closest to the alley.
- Mr. Fleming stated that the large patio space was reasonable.
- Mr. Papineau agreed.

discussion:

motion by

Mr. Fleming/ Mr. Reeds

Motion

To approve the variances as submitted.

Vote

5-0 to Approve.**3. address****38 East Sixth Avenue****1288 N. High LLC.**

app no.:

UID_18-12-007

applicant:

Connie Klema/1288 N. High LLC.

reviewed:

Variances**4:35 – 4:44**

Staff Report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Ms. Klema presented the proposal

discussion:

- Mr. Petruziello asked if it was included in the Kroger variances.
- Ms. Klema said it was not.
- Ms. Klema added all landscaping would be code compliance.
- Mr. Reed asked if they were going to install parking blocks.
- Ms. Klema said it had already been done.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if she would come back for the fencing and the landscaping.
- Ms. Klema said she would.

Motion by:

Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Petruziello

motion

To approve the variances as submitted.

Vote:

5-0 to approve**C. Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/ or Conceptual Review****1. address****1980 North High Street****Evolved**

app no.:

UID_18-09-010

applicant:

Michael Scherl/MES Painting

reviewed:

Code Violation-Signs**4:44 – 5:00**

Staff Report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Mr. Scherl presented the proposal.

<p>discussion:</p> <p>Motion by:</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>Vote:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked why the 1980 couldn't be on the lower panel horizontal sign. • Mr. Scherl said he thought that was what the board wanted. • Mr. Petruziello asked why the lower panel was a different color, and did it have to be shaded? • Mr. Fleming said he didn't love the gradient and it seemed dated, but it should be consistent. • Mr. Petruziello said it could have a small address, no bigger than it previously was, but no graphics. • Mr. Mr. Fleming asked if the blade sign could not be oval and have the same form as the text. • Mr. Petruziello said the frame should be the darkest green of the sign or black, not the lighter green. • Mr. Teba asked if the gap created by the removed projecting sign should be improved. • Mr. Scherl said they could extend the front panel to meet the brick. • Mr. Fleming said just leave as is, and reface it. • Mr. Scherl stated the image in the rear would be a textured vinyl that allows the brick joints to be seen. • Mr. Papineau asked if the board had a preference for the dinosaur egg graphic to be on the rear wall or the wall to the left of the entrance. • Mr. Scherl stated that they would prefer it on the wall. • Mr. Petruziello replied that the wall was not their space, they would need to get permission from the other property owner. • Mr. Petruziello stated that if the projecting sign wasn't illuminated, why not make it thinner? • Ms. Uhas Sauer said it could be the dinosaur egg. • Mr. Fleming said that if Evolved gets permission from the adjacent owner to put an image on the side wall, then they could come back to the board. • Mr. Teba said if it was artwork then it should be ok. • Mr. Fleming said that there were some guidelines, because it did constitute as advertising. <p>Mr. Fleming / Ms. Uhas Sauer</p> <p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lower marquee just have the words Evolved body art on the horizontal portion. • The green and black background be extended to the lower section of the marquee, the applicant can place the address in small lettering on that portions • The projecting sign be made thinner, and take the form of an ellipse to match the graphics within, and the outer edge be made black to match the gradient within it. • The mural in the back does not require any changes <p>5-0 to approve</p>
<p>2. address</p> <p>app no.:</p> <p>applicant:</p> <p>reviewed:</p> <p>5:00 – 5:23</p> <p>Staff Report:</p> <p>discussion:</p>	<p>190 West 8th Avenue</p> <p>Multi-Family</p> <p>UID_18-12-009</p> <p>Michael Church</p> <p>Code Violation- Deviation from plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Church presented the proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Church stated that he had some additional plans approved by Dan Ferdelman that already had removed the windows on the west side. • Mr. Mr. Teba asked if the windows were the only differences that were approved. • Mr. Church replied that was correct. He also stated that he window trim he replaced was of an incorrect size. • Mr. Fleming stated that the differences on the rear of the structure were the ac unit enclosures. Dan approved the deletion of the windows. There is a trim work missing on the back porch, capitals and bases. On the front of the structure the capitals. • Mr. Church said on the original building there were round fluted columns with PVC pipe. • Mr. Fleming asked the applicant what he would like to do. • Mr. Church said he submitted the changes. • Mr. Petruziello asked what large front window cornice details meant. • Mr. Church said he would like to leave the windows but change the trim. • Mr. Petruziello said that the lack of 1x4's around the windows was the biggest issue. • Mr. Fleming agreed. A traditional window would have a casing around it. The casing he replaced were too heavy, but these were too thin. • Mr. Fleming said put more of a board along the top of the picture window, put trim on the porch, widen the

	<p>steps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Church asked if widening the steps was a stickler. He added that the house was in very bad shape when he purchased it, the foundation was sinking. • Mr. Fleming said the cornices on the columns were pretty easy. • Mr. Petruziello said that they had entices and were round and fluted. • Mr. Church said the current posts were 6x6. • Mr. Church asked if he could change the posts and leave the steps. • Mr. Fleming said he would prefer the posts to stay and the steps to be widened. • Ms. Uhas Sauer said that the lower window is what bothered her the most. The narrow stairway was also very odd. The columns did not bother her that much. It is just lacking the details of the original house. • Mr. Reeds said that the problem is that the porch reads so heavy, while the windows read so light. • Mr. Teba added that the windows were probably closer to the originals than what Mr. Church replaced, but the issue was the trim.
Motion by:	Mr. Papineau/ Ms. Uhas Sauer
Motion:	<p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The four large windows on the front façade have 1x4 trim installed on all four sides. That the door be trimmed the same, as well as the one window on the west front corner. • That the columns have a capital trim of around 1x6" on all columns on the front and rear on all the bearing points (top and bottom)
Vote:	5-0 to approve

D.	5:23- 5:25	Staff Issued Certificates of Approval	
		Items approved:	
1.	UID_18-12-002 1506-1508 Summit Street	Parking	11/27/2018
2.	UID_18-12-003 53 East 12 th Avenue	Balcony/Stairs	11/28/2018
3.	UID_18-12-004 119 East 13 th Avenue	Porch	11/30/2018
4.	UID_18-12-005 1393 North High Street	Windows	12/12/2018
	Motion:	To approve the staff approvals	
	Vote:	5-0 to approve	
E.		Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval	
		items approved	COA issued
1.	UID_18-11-003 1428 North High Street	Domino’s Sign	11/27/2018
2.	UID_18-11-005 1572 North High Street	Coffee Connections Sign	11/27/2018
3.	UID_18-09-007 139-141 West Ninth Avenue	Multi-family Addition	11/20/2018
4.	UID_18-11-007 124 West 8 th Avenue	Variances	11/15/2018
F.		Next Meeting	
1.	January 24, 2019 111 North Front Street, Room 204 4:00pm		